



Meeting Notes

Process and Procedures Focus Group Meeting

10:00 a.m. – Monday, July 20, 2009

APS Conference Room, 101 West Cherry Ave, Flagstaff, AZ

1. Welcome and Introductions

In attendance:

Vince Knaggs, City of Flagstaff
Tish Bogan-Ozman, Real Estate
Steve Dorsett, Citizen
Georgia Duncan, Citizen
Roger E. Eastman, City of Flagstaff
Kent Hotsenpiller, Mogollon Engineering
Ed Larsen, City of Flagstaff
Paul Moore, PWM Architect
David Monihan, SEC, Inc.
David Walker, NABA
Mark Sawyers, City of Flagstaff
Neil Gullickson, City of Flagstaff

2. Recap Focus Group purpose

The Focus Group will be outcome focused with a strong emphasis on general issues rather than getting into the details of technical code review. A primary goal is to ensure that the code implements the Regional Plan.

3. Discussion regarding processes and procedures and related issues associated with the rewrite of the Land Development Code

Review of survey regarding review times for other Arizona cities:

- Overview of survey by Mark Sawyers
- In general review times for Flagstaff are better than other surveyed communities in the state – but we are slower in TIAs and public improvement plans (first review) overall
- While Yuma is generally fastest overall, they contract out review services. Initial plan review is quick – but field changes are very slow.
- Kent – very rare that a site plan is approved in 21 days. Agreed that the noted review times are accurate. Real issue though is dealing with conflicts within the existing code – this takes a LOT of time.
- Quality of submittals is a key determinant in the amount of time it takes to secure approval.

Economic Impacts:

- 1991 amendments – trees drove site design
- Be careful we do not make the code more restrictive with an unforeseen result of making development harder
- Prop 207 will limit our ability to make more restrictive regulations (i.e. result in greater economic impact to the developer)
- We will test the new code to ensure that increased costs to development are minimized

Coordination of staff comments:

- Need for better coordination of staff comments
- Separate code related comments from suggestions
- SPOC (Single Point of Contact) has really helped
- Not really a zoning code issue – deal with in implementation
- Need for SPOC (project representative) for developers as well

Minor Land Divisions:

- Review the thresholds for minor divisions at which a requirement for public improvements kicks in
- MLDs – statute provides a simplified administrative process for smaller subdivisions
- Statute provides regulations on the number of splits that can be processed in MLDs.

Graduated regulations for the scale of a project:

- Make review of smaller projects (e.g. infill) easier and more administrative than larger projects. Need a
- Graduated time frame process – 3, 5, 7 week for commercial projects
- County has three step process for subdivisions – 10 lots, 20 lots and over 20 lots
- Also look at simplified process for subdivisions based on their size
- Explore further ... especially for infill projects (reduced fees, reduced time frame for approval) Example – Comfort Keepers where there was only a minor change in use, and no construction. Suggest that this should not have gone to DRB – staff review only.
- Create review/processing time incentives for small projects – some are already in the design guidelines.

Public Participation discussion again:

Mark/Pat – even if a project has entitlement rights, we should think of a way to let people know about a new development

Requirement for professionals to make submittals to ensure a better quality of submittals:

- Often people do not know what they are doing and don not realize that a professional is required by Statute – results in delays; then they hire a professional to complete the work anyway
- Need to review thresholds in the existing code (actually lacking) – need to be added.
- Add a requirement for professionals over a certain threshold for site planning applications. If a professional is eventually needed, the professional should be brought onto the team sooner rather than later.

4. **Next meeting:** None – mission accomplished. Good job all!

5. **Adjournment** at 11:03 am.